

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the outstanding Office action. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, 17-40, 42, 44-54 and 58-61 are presently pending. Claims 4, 6, 14-16, 41, 43, 55-57 and 62-64 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 11-13, 17-20, 23-34, 42, 44-45 and 47-54 have been amended.

The Applicant's attorney is concurrently filing an IDS and EIDS for the Examiner's review. The Applicants' attorney also filed EIDSs on December 23, 2003 and June 2, 2004. Copies of the previously filed EIDSs are provided for the convenience of the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review the cited art and return initialed copies of the EIDSs. The Applicant's attorney believes the art indicated in the IDSs are no more relevant than the presently cited art.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-23, 30, 34-43, 45-48, 53-55 and 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Pope et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,616 B1).

Claims 3, 11-12, 24-25 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pope et al.* in view of *Mayes et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,763).

Claims 6, 15, 17, 26-29, 31-33, 44, 51-52 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pope et al.*

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-23, 30, 34-43, 45-48, 53-55 and 58-64 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-23, 30, 34-43, 45-48, 53-55 and 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Pope et al.*

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include many of the limitations found in cancelled claims 4, 6, 14 and 15.

Claim 1 calls for "a hand-held device...comprising... a first transceiver to communicate with a cellular network and a second transceiver to communicate with the wireless local area network using short-range radio signals...the storage device stores a router software component...and an interface software component to add a first network service software component that provides a network service to the wireless local area network [loaded from a processing device]...."

Pope et al. does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1. *Pope et al.*'s communication system 10 shown in Figs. 1 and 4 does not teach or suggest "a first transceiver to communicate with a cellular network and a second transceiver to communicate with the wireless local area network using short-range radio signals..." In contrast, *Pope et al.* teaches a single transceiver 11 used by communication system 10 for communicating with local WLAN 20 (or "a cellular network") shown in

Figs. 2 and 4. *Pope et al.* teaches that transceiver 11 transfers cellular signals in various cellular protocols such as TDMA, CDMA and FDMA. Col 4, lines 1-7. *Pope et al.* does not teach or suggest “a second transceiver to communicate with the wireless network using short-range radio signals...” Fig. 1 does not show the additional transceiver. Figs. 2 and 4 do not illustrate communication systems 10a and 10b “communicat[ing] ... using the short-range radio signals....” *Pope et al.* teaches a single transceiver to communicate with local WLAN 20 using cellular signals.

Pope et al. also does not teach or suggest “the storage device stores a router software component to transfer a packet between the cellular network and the wireless local area network using the short-range radio signals and an interface software component to add a first network service software component that provides a network service to the wireless local area network...” In rejecting this limitation, the Examiner cited Col. 4, lines 8-12 that states: “communication system 10 may be programmed with well-known mobile Internet Protocol (IP) software, firmware and the like...” However, this passage refers to communication system 10 “programmed with well-known mobile Internet Protocol (IP)” so that it can communicate with WLAN 20 or a cellular network. Accordingly, “mobile Internet Protocol (IP)” does not teach “a router software component to transfer a packet between the cellular network and the wireless local area network using short-range radio signals...” *Pope et al.* does not teach communication system 10 that “transfers a packet between the cellular network [or WLAN 20] and the wireless local area network using short-range radio signals...”

Pope et al. also does not teach or suggest “an interface software component to add a first network service software component that provides a network service to the wireless local area network [loaded from a processing device]....” *Pope et al.* does not teach or suggest local WAN 20 or Wide Area Network 41 having “a processing device” that loads “a first network software component” into communication system 10. Likewise, *Pope et al.* does not teach or suggest a communication system 10 that “stores...an interface software component to add a first network service software component...”

Claims 2, 5, 7-10, 13, 18-23 and 30 depend from claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 1.

Independent claim 34 has been amended to include many of the limitations of claim 41. Claim 34 has many of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore is patentable for similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 1.

Further, claim 34 calls for “a first wireless device having a short-range transceiver ...” and “a second wireless device having a short-range transceiver...” that are not taught or suggest by *Pope et al.*

Claims 35-40 depend from claim 34 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 34.

Independent claim 42 has been amended to include many of the limitations of claim 43. Claim 42 has many of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore is patentable for similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 1.

Claims 45-48 and 53 depend from claim 42 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 42.

Independent claim 54 has been amended to include many of the limitations of claim 55.

Claim 54 has many of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore is patentable for similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 1.

Further, claim 54 calls for "the managing processing device has a managing software component to enable the loaded first network service software component." *Pope et al.* does not teach or suggest "enable[ing] the loaded first network service software component."

Claims 55 and 58-61 depend from claim 54 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claim 54.

While the Applicant's attorney disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claims 62-64, these claims have been cancelled to expedite prosecution.

It is respectfully requested the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 13-14, 16, 18-23, 30, 34-43, 45-48, 53-55 and 58-64 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 11-12, 24-25 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 11-12, 24-25 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pope et al.* in view of *Mayes et al.*

Mayes et al. likewise does not teach or suggest the limitation of independent claims 1 and 42 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claims 1 and 42.

Claims 3, 11-12, 24-25 and 49-50 depend from claims 1 and 42 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claims 1 and 42.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 11-12, 24-25 and 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. Rejection of Claims 6, 15, 17, 26-29, 31-33, 44, 51-52 and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 15, 17, 26-29, 31-33, 44, 51-52 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pope et al.*

Claims 17, 26-29 and 31-33 depend from claim 1 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claims 1.

Claims 44 and 51-52 depend from claim 42 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above in regard to claims 42.

While the Applicant's attorney disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claims 56-57, these claims have been cancelled to expedite prosecution.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 15, 17, 26-29, 31-33, 44, 51-52 and 56-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

IV. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, 17-40, 42, 44-54 and 58-61 is respectfully requested.

Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 13, 2005

By: 

Kirk J. DeNiro
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, CA 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665